

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/781,045	Applicant(s) KORZINOV ET AL.	
	Examiner Yun H. Lee	Art Unit 3766	

All Participants:

(1) Yun H. Lee.

(2) William E. Hunter.
Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 March 2006
Time: 12 PM
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

1-34

Prior art documents discussed:

McClure et al. (US Pat. No. 6,711,438)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner stated that McClure et al. reads on the limitations of claim 1. Thus, the examiner suggested that the limitations of claim 3 be included in claim 1 to put it in proper form for issue. The attorney stated that the invention differs from McClure et al. since the invention filters T waves in the frequency domain whereas McClure et al. blanks T waves in the time domain. Further, the attorney stated that the applicant would agree to specifically claim a frequency domain T wave filter..